

WBK  
W628  
1860

WBK  
W628  
1860



WHO, WHICH, WHAT AND WHEREFORE:

OR,

## A FEW FACTS

FOR THE

# HOMŒOPATHIC PROFESSION.

---

"*Ubi dolor, ibi digitus.*" "One must need scratch where it itches."

*Burton's Anatomie of Melancholie.*

"A puppet-play must be shadowed and seen in the dark: for draw the curtain, *et sordet gesticulatio.*

"Imposture is a specious thing: yet never worse than where it feigns to be best, and to none discovered sooner than the simplest. Imposture is ever ashamed of the light.

"If I have anything right, defend it as Truth's, not mine, save, as it conduceth to a common good. It profits not me to have any man fence or fight for me, to flourish, or take my side. Stand for Truth, and 'tis enough."

*Ben Jonson's Discoveries.*

---

PHILADELPHIA:

1860.

WBK  
W628  
1860

In the *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin* and the *Evening Journal* of March 1st, and in the *Public Ledger* of March 2d, appeared a notice of the Twelfth Annual Commencement of the Homœopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania, and also the following :

### C A R D

#### *To the Homœopathic Profession.*

GENTLEMEN :—The undersigned, candidates for the Degree of Doctor of Medicine and Doctor of Homœopathic Medicine, have been "black-balled."

Actuated by the holiest attributes of our common nature, honor and filial duty, we ask a suspension of opinion until the circumstances are presented to the profession.

(Signed) SAMUEL A. JONES,  
JACOB REED, JR.

*Philada., March 1st, 1860.*

The purpose of this paper is the presentation of those *circumstances*.

Between the dates February 19 and 25, S. A. Jones, J. Reed, Jr., and F. H. Ehrmann, submitted themselves to the regular examinations for the degree of the above-mentioned College. The method of balloting in this institution is, that each professor shall cast five balls; that twenty-five "white balls" is the smallest number entitling the candidate to a degree, and that less than twenty of the same color, shall prevent the recipient from entering that realm of felicity yclept "The Omnibus Class," *i. e.* being again examined, but in the presence of and by all the chairs.

The candidates, S. A. Jones, J. Reed and F. H. Ehrmann received each eighteen "white balls," and as the chairs are seven, and the votes of each five, we received seventeen "black balls." These votes were cast as follows :

Jacob Beakley, M.D., Prof. of Surgery, five black; John Redman Coxe, Jr., M.D., Prof. of Homœopathic Institutes, Pathology and the Practice of Medicine, five black; Isaac M. Ward, M.D., Prof. of Obstetrics, Diseases of Women and Children, and Medical Jurisprudence, five black; M. Semple, M.D., Prof. of Chemistry and Toxicology, two black and three white. [We do not say we are exactly struck by the somewhat significant correspondence between our respective votes from Professrs Beakley, Ward and Coxe; still we may be pardoned if we happen to consider it *rather peculiar*.]

Thus after six days of that agreeable suspense common to "examination week," during which period the *vis circumstance* quarrelled with the *vis vita*, and played sundry scurvy tricks upon those portions of our individual anatomies known as *Nervous System* and *Digestive Apparatus*, producing the consequent *depression of spirits*; after this time we found ourselves "black-balled."

I more than half suspect we were "bad boys," for, upon hearing the result of the ballot, observing the *coincidence in the number of our votes*, and FINDING OUT BEYOND DOUBT who had favored us with "blackies," we endorsed Hamlet's remark : "There's something rotten in Denmark," exception being only taken with regard to the geography.

On the morning of February 27th, S. A. Jones, J. Reed, Jr., and F. H. Ehrmann waited upon the Hon. A. V. Parsons, President of Board of Managers of the Homœopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania, and presented the following protest, which the Honorable President submitted to the gentlemen of the Board on the evening of the same date.

*To the Honorable the President and the Gentlemen of the Board of Managers of the Homœopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania.*

GENTLEMEN :—We, the undersigned, Matriculants of the Homœopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania, request the Degree of Doctor of Medicine from the Honorable President and Board of Managers, and for the following reasons :

We have complied with the requisitions demanded of the candidates for the Degree of Doctor of Medicine according to the "Regulations of the College."

We have broken no law, violated no regulation, infringed upon no privileges.

Our course of study has been of the required length of time, our tickets are of the required number, and in this respect we are entitled to the Degree of Doctor of Medicine.

Our examinations before each Professor were of such a character as to entitle us to a number of votes sufficient to secure the Degree; and we were assured that our examinations were satisfactory by the very ones who we believe "black-balled" us.

We believe, know, and are prepared to show, that we have been foully dealt with, and that threats have been uttered which will prove that we were rejected from *personal motives*.

We are prepared to show that the cause of our rejection is in the following :

In the early part of the present course a feeling of dissatisfaction was entertained with regard to the manner in which Professors Beakley and Coxe performed the duties devolving upon them as the incumbents of the chairs of Surgery and the Practice of Medicine.

This dissatisfaction was not confined to "second course" students, but was expressed by the majority of those attending their first session. A number of candidates for graduation, not fearing "the powers that be," not bound by the chains of policy, nor intent *only* upon getting a "degree," did



openly express their disapprobation, and, actuated by a love for the science and art of Homœopathic Medicine, and by a desire to further the best interests of the Homœopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania, prepared themselves to take action in this matter.

A paper was drawn up expressing a candid opinion of the Professors Beakley and Cox, which paper was intended to be submitted to the students of '59 and 60," at a time when the honest expression of their convictions could not bring upon them the vindictive wrath of the interested parties.

Information of this intent was conveyed to Prof. Beakley; he then awed many of those at one time concerned in the movement and they withdrew from policy;\* their opinions are still unchanged, though suppressed.

Prof. Beakley then *threatened* the chief movers in this matter, and the result is, as it is, we are defrauded of our legal rights.

We ask the Honorable President and Board of Managers, as men, to give this matter an unbiassed, unimpassioned and thorough investigation. We ask for justice. We have truth on our side and justice is not far off.

If partialities and the influence of cliques are to deprive us of our just rights we shall exercise our privilege and appeal to the medical profession at large,

Our case is without a precedent, but, if necessitated we will establish one, even at the expense of our insulted, injured and nearly ruined Alma Mater.

We pray this may not be received as a braggart threat, the fruit of thwarted ambition, of spleen, or of malice.

There is a time when all that is manly in man will arise and exercise its godlike prerogative of demanding its alienable rights; and there is also a time when man, hearing the demand, must deal godlike justice or forfeit the name of man.

Very respectfully,

your humble servants,

(Signed) SAMUEL A. JONES,  
JACOB REED, Jr.,  
F. HAHNEMANN EHRMANN.

At the same time Professors Thomas Moore, M.D., Wm. A. Reed, M.D., and C. J. Hempel, M.D., members of the Faculty of the Homœopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania, did offer to the same convocation the following protest:

"*Philada., Feb. 27th, 1860.*

"*To the Honorable President: The Members of the Board of Managers of the Homœopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania.*

The undersigned, members of the Faculty

\*They were at the time of writing, but before the degrees were given some of these very students signed a paper endorsing sentiments the very reverse of those we mention. This paper was gotten up wholly, or in part, by a student who had denounced Prof. Beakley, as a surgeon, in no measured terms. We are now convinced that some students will "blow hot and cold" for a degree. All honor to their principles!

of the College, do hereby protest against the rejection of Samuel A. Jones, Francis Hahnemann Ehrmann and Jacob Reed, Jr., candidates for the degree of Doctor of Medicine, for the following reasons:

I. Each of these gentlemen has complied with all the requirements of the College, as declared in their published regulations, necessary for the qualifications for the degree of the College.

II. Each gentleman has been fairly and impartially examined by the undersigned, and, without exception, has been found completely furnished in the knowledge of the several branches of Medical Science as taught by their respective Chairs.

III. We have reason to believe that they have all of them given such evidence of their attainments in the other branches as should warrant their approval by the rest of the Faculty.

IV. We have reason to believe that their rejection has been the result of *personal malice*, excited by their free expression of opinion respecting the MERITS OF PROFESSORS Jacob Beakley and John Redman Cox, Jr., AS TEACHERS OF SURGERY AND THE PRACTICE OF MEDICINE.

V. We do know that threats were made by the Dean of the College that an expression of opinion concerning the merits of himself and Dr. Cox "would be fatal" to those gentlemen who would venture to express such opinion. These threats were uttered on several occasions before the time for the balloting for candidates for the degree.

We do therefore earnestly appeal to you, representing the corporation of the College, to allow the degree of the College to the above named gentlemen, believing that it is now improperly withheld in consequence of the exercise of PERSONAL MALICE and from WOUNDED PRIDE rather than by a FAIR BALLOT INTENDED to declare a JUST ESTIMATE of the ATTAINMENTS of the several candidates."

Very respectfully,

Your humble servants,

(Signed) THOMAS MOORE, M.D.,  
Prof. of Anatomy.

WM. A. REED, M.D.,  
Prof. of Physiology.

CHAS. J. HEMPEL, M.D.,  
Prof. of Mat. Med. and Therap.

Professor Wm. A. Reed, as spokesman, arose for the purpose of submitting this document to the Honorable President and Board of Managers.

Henry Homer, Esq., of the Board of Managers, moved that nothing be received by them unless presented through the Dean of the Faculty, Prof. Jacob Beakley. This motion was seconded and carried.

Prof. Reed then begged to leave the protest with the Honorable President for his personal inspection and instruction.

Later in the evening, and when Professors Moore, Reed and Hempel had left the meet-



ing, the chairs of Physiology, and Materia Medica and Therapeutics, occupied respectively by Professor Reed and Professor Hempel, were declared vacant.

Our document, thanks to the Honorable President, did not abort. It enjoyed a regular delivery, and the result was Jacob Reed, Jr., received the following communication:

*"To Messrs. Sam. A. Jones, Francis H. Ehrmann, Jacob Reed, Jr.:*

Gentlemen:—Your petition was received this evening making complaint of certain members of the Faculty; the whole case has been referred to Doctors Williamson and Helmuth, who, assisted by Doctors Semple and Ward, will re-examine and report to the board.

You will therefore please report yourselves for examination to the above named gentlemen, who will doubtless appoint a time for the purpose.

W. E. G. AGNEW,  
Sec'y B. M. Hom. Coll. of Med.

Jacob Reed, Jr., Esq.:

Sir:—Please show the above to your co-complainants and oblige.

Yours, &c.,

W. E. G. AGNEW,  
Sec'y B. M."

At the time of receiving this document, Jacob Reed, Jr., and his "co-complainants" were in the following condition:

They had gone through "examination week" with its long anxious hours of hoping and fearing, yearning and desponding, such hours as every earnest student has known and will yet know. They were aware of Professor J. Beakley's *avowed threat* that the expression of an honest opinion would "prove fatal" to them. They calculated the probable extent of his influence, and placing the vote expected from him and his particular friends at the lowest consistent point this side of a total "black-balling" they found themselves safe. The result of the ballot had shown them the fallacy of their even desponding estimate—for it was a desponding and not a deserving estimate. The votes of Professors Beakley, Coxe and Ward declared them TOTALLY IGNORANT in the branches of Surgery, Practice and Obstetrics. Saturday night they "went through the motions" of sleeping; *encored* the "same motions" on Sunday night, and "ex-necessitate" repeated the *encore* on Monday night. Wearied from loss of sleep; worn with anxiety and unavoidable nervous prostration; stung with shame; jeered and cursed by the sycophant traitors of the "Class;" disgraced before the Profession and friends, and asked to stand another examination, and part of it before Isaac M. Ward, M.D., Professor of Obstetrics—a man who had proven himself FALSE at one examination, and who was to be taken simply on the trust of a generous credulity upon a second trial.

While in this state the following note was received:

*"Philadelphia, Feb. 23th, 1860.*

Mr. Jacob Reed, Jr.:

Dear Sir:—Be kind enough to inform Messrs. Jones and Ehrmann, that, Drs. Helmuth, Ward, Semple and myself will meet them and yourself at the College this evening at 8 o'clock, for the purpose of giving you a re-examination, if you desire it.

(Signed) Very respectfully,  
W. WILLIAMSON."

On the evening of February 28th, we presented ourselves before the Committee for the purpose of submitting to such an examination as was compatible with honor and justice. Samuel A. Jones was first called into the examining room. M. Semple, M. D., Prof. of Chemistry, proceeded to examine him upon the subject pertaining to his chair. Mr. Jones declined being re-examined upon Chemistry, Physiology, Anatomy, and Materia Medica and Therapeutics, but expressed a willingness to be interrogated upon Surgery, Practice, and Obstetrics, those branches upon which Prof.'s Beakley, Coxe, and Ward had pronounced him TOTALLY IGNORANT. Mr. Jones gave as his reason for refusing a re-examination upon the specified four branches the fact that, upon them he had received at the regular balloting, some "white balls," at the same time asserting that if any Professor gave him one "white ball" it did not belong to him, as a student, to QUESTION THE ESTIMATE HIS TEACHER WAS PLEASED, OR BOUND, TO PLACE UPON HIS ATTAINMENTS. He only held that, when a Professor's vote bore an absurdity and a FALSEHOOD upon the face of it, he had the right of demanding an opportunity of proving that ABSURDITY and FALSEHOOD.

That there might be no equivocation upon what "white balls" he had received, he asked the committee to examine the following testimonials.

*"Phila., Feb. 28, 1860.*

This certifies that Samuel A. Jones has been diligently examined by me, in Physiology and Hygiene, and has been found entitled to my full vote in balloting for candidates for the Degree of Doctor of Medicine.

(Signed) WM. A. REED, M. D.,  
Prof. of Physiology,  
Hom. Med. College of Penna."

*"Phila., Feb. 28, 1860.*

This is to certify that Mr. Samuel A. Jones has been examined by me in Materia Medica and Therapeutics, and that I have found him entitled to my full vote, and that I cast my full vote in his favor at the balloting given on Saturday evening, Feb. 25th.

(Signed) CHAS. J. HEMPEL, M. D."

In addition to the above each of us now possesses a certificate similar to the following:

*"Phila., Feb. 28th, 1860.*

I take pleasure in stating that I have carefully examined Samuel A. Jones, upon Anatomy, and that I



The gentlemen to whom these were submitted, declined examining them, with the exception of W. Williamson, M. D., who said he "would look at them out of courtesy."

The Committee would not examine Mr. Jones on the conditions stated, and he withdrew. J. Reed, Jr., was next called. He declined a full examination;—asking only the privilege of proving how false and foul was the vote of Prof.'s Ward, Coxe and Beakley. He was dismissed without an examination.

F. H. Ehrman submitted himself to a full examination, and was again "black-balled;" though, thanks to the presence of Drs. Hel-muth and Williamson, not so badly as at the Faculty ballot.\*

Prof. Moore, not approving of the conduct of Drs. Beakley, Coxe, and Ward, tendered his resignation to the Board of Managers.

AFTER his resignation had been handed in, reports were circulated among the students, stating that the Professor of Anatomy was resigning from pecuniary considerations.

Upon hearing of these statements. Dr. Moore presented the following document to the Hon. President and Board of Managers.

"Philadelphia, March 1st, 1860.

To the Honorable President and Board of Managers of the Homœopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania:

GENTLEMEN:—The Dean of the Faculty will present you my resignation as Professor of Anatomy in the Homœopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania. I deem it my duty to you, as Managers of the Institution, to state plainly the reasons inducing this step.

Firstly. I cannot consent to remain a member of the Faculty, when I am convinced that *questionable influences* have prevented a fair ballot in the case of some of our candidates for the degree of Doctor of Medicine.

Secondly. I hold that no Professor has a moral or legal right to allow any influence to come between him and the ballot-box, except the medical attainments of the candidate.

Thirdly. Each of the candidates, S. A. Jones, J. Reed, Jr., and F. H. Ehrmann, had been declared by the Faculty entitled to an examination according to the requisitions expressed in the fourth paragraph of the published regulations for the session of 1859 and '60.

Fourthly. The fact of their having been admitted to the examinations before the

cast my full vote in his favor at the ballot given on Saturday, 25th inst.

(Signed)

THOMAS MOORE, M. D.,

Prof. Anatomy.

Hom. Med. Coll. of Penna."

\* You will remember that at the Faculty ballot Mr. Ehrmann was declared *totally ignorant* upon the branches of Surgery, and the Practice of Medicine. As a comment upon this allow us to state that at the re-examination Mr. Ehrmann was catechised upon Anatomy, Surgery, Practice and Materia Medica, by Drs. Hel-muth and Williamson; and their votes were 5, 5, 5, 4. *Well done Beakley, Coxe & Co.!*

Professors shows that they had complied with every requisition laid down in the above mentioned paragraph.

Fifthly. I have had personal acknowledgments made to me by the Professor of Practice that, he had the right to be influenced in his ballot by other considerations than the merit of the Student: and by the Prof. of Chemistry, that F. H. Ehrmann could not have passed even if the first ballot had been conducted without bias; thereby implicitly admitting that such bias existed.

Sixthly. I cannot consent to remain a member of a Faculty where colleagues, who have discharged their duty as teachers and gentlemen,\* can be removed by the Board of Managers upon the *ex parte* testimony of avowed enemies.

Seventhly.—I cannot afford to sacrifice my time and money to assist in sustaining an institution where such things are allowed and justified.

In conclusion, let me state that I shall be found ever ready to work for your institution, if I can be associated with colleagues in whose ability and devotion to Homœopathy I can have full confidence; and that even pecuniary sacrifices shall never deter me from performing my whole duty in this sacred cause.

(Signed,) THOMAS MOORE, M.D."

On Thursday, March 1st, the "Com-mencement" transpired, and Prof. Beakley's threat, that the expression of our opinion of him as a surgeon should "prove fatal," was fulfilled to his complete satisfaction.

We were told, by a respectable Homœopathic physician, that the publishing of this paper would injure the School, and we were advised to await the annual meeting of the corporators of the College, to lay our case before them, and to publish only if they denied us justice.

The Corporators met: the party were so strong (numerically) that a *most unconstitutional* motion to omit reading the Minutes of the Board of Managers for the past year was put, and although protested against, carried. Of course, we obtained no hearing.

This ends the chapter. We have stated the facts of our case; we have told "the truth, and nothing but the truth," yet, not "the whole truth," for there are circumstances which we can only state from the witness-box; we are without our degree; disgraced before the Profession and our

\* NOTE.—Henry P. Lloyd, (one of this "Board of Managers," in a conversation with S. A. Jones, said: "We have a right to turn out a professor without asking him any questions." This was a reply made to a remark of Mr. Jones', that the Board of Managers had turned out Profs. Hempel and Reed, without allowing them the prerogative of the guiltiest criminal: the right to be heard in their own behalf; and, added Mr. J., you should have granted this to Drs. Hempel and Reed, inasmuch as they were turned out upon the *ex parte* testimony of their enemies.

Gentlemen assuming a professorial chair in the Homœopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania, will do well to consider in what a position they place their professional character. We hope this is a logical deduction.



friends, and may we not be allowed to write a few words for ourselves; to explain and justify our conduct?

Gentlemen of the Profession, we are poor and can afford to seek no other redress than an appeal to you. Your influence sustains the colleges of our school, and your voice can rebuke the wrongs perpetrated therein. Therefore, we ask from you all for which we now need care—a hearing, and a judgment.

Herein is our sin: We ventured from the student's humble seat to condemn palpable ignorance and culpable inefficiency, though it was throned in a Professor's chair.

When a professor of Surgery teaches that "the Ninth pair of nerves is composed of the Pneumogastric, the Spinal Accessory and the Descendens Noni," must the student, *because he is a student*, shout Amen!

When the same Professor teaches that "the Crystalline Lens is held in its place by the Hyaloid Membrane—that the Hyaloid Membrane *splits* and is reflected round the Lens, thus retaining it in its place," must the student cry—So be it!

When this identical Professor (?) teaches that "the inner layer of the Retina is *vascular*, and is formed from the Arteria Centralis Retinæ *by its expansion*," must the student echo—Even so! O infelix *we!* for we could not do it.

Let us assert that we are not joking; we have been thus taught. We need not, here, multiply instances; but if occasion requires, our note-books shall give up *all* these choice droppings from such professorial lips.

Is there a time when the student may judge the Teacher? If you rebuke such an attempt as presumption, what will you do when the even student's judgment is the offspring not of vain conceit, but of absolute necessity?

Can man say what he will see, and what he will not? *\* Seeing*, can he *help forming* an opinion? If the student holds an honest, undeniable and irrefutable opinion, may he not, on his own responsibility, give it expression! If personal profit says *not*, must he selfishly act from policy, and be dumb, though he cannot be blind? If, however, the truths on which his opinion is based, are injurious, yea, fatal to a cause solemn as life itself, may not even a student, throwing aside personal profit and selfish policy, condemn unpardonable ignorance, though it be throned in the very Holy of Holies of his *Alma Mater*?

The buyer judges the thing bought, and

may not the student judge the teachings for which he has paid? A violation of a contract for certain articles, of a certain quality, at a certain price, is made amenable to the law; but, tell me, what redress has the student who bargains for the best article, at the best price, and receives what his own text-books teach him to contradict, and *contradict upon tenable grounds*? Will the law reach knavery when it steals the garb of Wisdom?

We claim the right to judge what we buy, even though Jacob Beakley, M. D., be the seller; and we will say to that gentleman, we believe the honest tradesman need never blush for his wares, nor the *true workman* ever be ashamed or fearful of his work; it bears the *\*sine cera* stamp of truth, and he need not fear the trial.

A student's opinion is simply a *student's* opinion: if faulty it will receive a just condemnation, and the judged one need not fear; but if even a student's *dictum* be based on an immutable truth, it will make a knave and a charlatan tremble: and more than this, it will not, it cannot be suppressed.

S. A. Jones and J. Reed, Jr., declined a full examination from the Committee: allow us to explain the motives which induced such a course.

We hold that, having received even one "white ball" from a Professor, we have no right to question his estimate of our proficiency in the teachings of his chair; but if declared *totally ignorant* by any teacher, knowing such an estimate to be false, we claim a student's right to prove the falsity of his vote, and vindicate our character as students.

We declined a full examination on this ground; but there are other considerations, viz: by the regulations of the College we were not entitled, by the vote we received, to a second examination, and when the Board of Managers, having received our protest, granted us a re-examination, it showed that they did not like the aspect of affairs, and it evinced a lack of confidence in some of the Faculty. As our protest expressed *our opinion* of Drs. Beakley and Cox, and as the protest of Drs. Moore, Reed and Hempel testified to their desire to give us justice, the suspicion of *foul dealing must have rested just exactly where it belonged*. Such being the case, when we were offered a second examination,

*\* As Jacob Beakley, M. D., has declared me totally ignorant of Surgery, allow me to display a little "larnin," lest, from having failed to pass his examination, a well-grounded charge of total ignorance in everything be brought against me.*

At the Roman potteries many jars were cracked in baking. These defective utensils the Roman potter, with Yankee shrewdness, prepared for market by filling the cracks with wax which when covered with glazing could not be perceived. Upon being used the fire soon revealed the fraud; and the people when wanting a genuine article would not buy unless the potter, balancing a jar would strike it with his hand and say "*sine cera*," *without wax*. (The Romans took a salesman's word: the Yankees are smarter.) From this we derive the word *sincere*, *without deceit*. Sincerity compels me to acknowledge that since I have lived in Philadelphia, I have become very intimately acquainted with some men who are *decidedly waxy!*

*\* NOTE.*—At S. A. Jones' final examination upon Surgery, Jacob Beakley, M.D., after giving Mr. J. a delightful perspiration, (Anglice "quiz.") told him, that would do. Mr. Jones was nimbly leaving a place and person so Allopathically sudorific, when the said Jacob Beakley, M.D., called him back to have a "talk with him." That conversation was a "quiz" upon the part Mr. J. had taken in the expression of opinion concerning Dr. Beakley's capability as a Surgeon, and the student "defined his position" to the Teacher in these words: "I believe the Chair of Surgery in the Homœopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania can be better filled than it now is." Then the Teacher said to the student, "You have no right to form an opinion, sir! You insult me, sir!"



we could not honorably allow ourselves to be re-examined upon those branches in which we had already been thoroughly "quizzed" and examined by gentlemen of unquestionable probity. We felt that the imputation which the investigation by our being catechized before the Committee would *nail* upon Profs. Beakley Coxe and Ward, should not even cast a shadow upon Profs. Moore, Reed and Hempel.

May we not ask, was it fair to permit Isaac M. Ward to sit in judgement upon us for a second time. We hold that he, by his vote at the first ballot, did forfeit all claim to our confidence.

In the case of S. A. Jones the foulest vote of the three blanks was that of this same Isaac M. Ward, M. D. Will he give S. A. Jones the opportunity of proving this in a court of justice? We put the question to him.

This Isaac M. Ward, M. D., had received sufficient testimony to prove that during the session of 1859 and '60, S. A. Jones had attended at least one Obstetric case, and in which instance the placenta had been retained (by adhesion) one hour and a quarter after the delivery of the child: it being then removed by Mr. Jones in the manner directed by W. Williamson M.D., in his lectures at the Homœopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania, during the session of 1858 and '59. Under these circumstances, what could we think of this Isaac M. Ward! a man, who, in the face of such facts pronounced a student to be *totally ignorant* of the teachings of his chair! a man having once cast such a vote, and then presuming to sit in second judgement upon the recipients of *his* justice at a first ballot! a man crowned with the grey hairs of age! a man who spake so solemnly of morality, yea, whose every lecture was tinged with the "moral element"! who ever entered his chair leading Religion by the hand, that She might impress his teachings, stimulate our endeavours and—point his periods:—such a man falsifying himself once, and accepting the opportunity of doing it again—O Shame, where is thy blush!

We would not omit doing justice to Doctors Helmuth and Williamson. We had all confidence in their integrity. We were willing to abide by their decision upon our attainments in Surgery, Practice and Obstetrics, but we could not allow an examination upon the other branches, before even these honorable men, to impugn the character of Professors Moore, Reed, and Hempel. We are confident we could have had justice from Doctors Helmuth and Williamson, but we could not pay the price demanded.

We here present the protest which Jacob Beakley avowed should "prove fatal" to the endorsers thereof.

*"To the Honorable President, the Board of Managers, and the Faculty of the Homœopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania."*

GENTLEMEN:—

We, the undersigned, Graduates and Students of the Homœopathic Medical College of

Pennsylvania, actuated by a love for the Art and Science of Homœopathic Medicine, and by an earnest desire to promote the best interests of our *Alma Mater*, do respectfully present this expression of our opinion concerning the present incumbents of the Chairs of the Practice of Medicine, and the Practice of Surgery.

We regard John Redman Coxe, Jr., M. D., as unworthy of the position he now occupies in the Faculty of the above-mentioned College, and for the following reasons:

*First.*—We most emphatically dissent from the views he expresses of Homœopathic Institutes: the principles he inculcates being repudiated by the best Homœopathic Physicians of America and Europe.

*Secondly.*—We declare his lectures to be most inefficient, inasmuch as in the whole period of our attendance he has not presented one single specimen designed to teach the changes transpiring in the various viscera during the progress of various diseases.

We feel that we cannot censure his conduct, in this respect, too strongly, inasmuch as a parallel course of teaching has not been pursued by any incumbent of the Chair of Practice in any College with which we are acquainted.

*Thirdly.*—We find him very remiss in the substance of his lectures. They are the fruit of reading, rather than of experience; and the course of reading is not, from its nature, at all calculated to interest, impress, and instruct the student.

We place but little value upon theories, yet we desire to be presented with such as are generally considered the nearest approximations to truth. In this respect we condemn Doctor Coxe's puerile and pedantic proclivities to quote from the most obsolete of the Ancients rather than from the Philosophical investigators of the past and the present century.

The Semeiology of the Ancients is good; but the *Ætiology*, and the *Pathology* of Modern Medical Science is far better, and we have had too little of this from Dr. Coxe.

*Fourthly.*—We must condemn the method of his lectures. We are confused by their lack of order and continuity. Doctor Coxe also diverged from his sphere, for we submit that the Professor of Practice should not assume to treat those diseases universally assigned for explanation, to the Chair of Surgery, and particularly as Doctor Coxe's Surgical treatment differed with that dictated by Doctor Beakley.

We are obliged to complain of Doctor Coxe's delivery. His enunciation is harsh, abrupt, and indistinct, adding another obstacle to the comprehension of his teachings.

*Fifthly.*—We do not believe Homœopathy consists in prescribing from the "totality of symptoms," ignoring Pathology, and we do not, for this reason, consider J. Redman Coxe Jr., M. D., a fit exponent of Homœopathy.



We consider Jacob Beakley, M. D., as positively and undeniably unfit to fill the Chair of Surgery in the Homœopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania, and for the following reasons :—

*First.*—He is shamefully ignorant of Anatomy.

*Secondly.*—He is not even a second rate operator. We have seen him fail in one of the minor operations. We have witnessed an operation of his so faultily done as to demand even a student's condemnation. Charges of *malar praxis* are sometimes based upon very similar cases.

*Thirdly.*—We know that his teachings vary from the most tenable positions taken by the best Surgical writers: variations of which we can judge, and which we know to be unequivocally erroneous.

*Fourthly.*—In his teachings he contradicts himself, thereby confusing the student, and destroying that confidence which it should be the hope and aim of the Teacher to inspire.

*Fifthly.*—His course of lectures is incomplete to even a greater degree than is necessitated by the time given. He is too fond of expressing opinions upon extraneous subjects, and wastes valuable time in so doing: "Beakley's flights of fancy" are a by-word.

*Sixthly.*—His lectures are a disgrace to the Homœopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania, inasmuch as the commonest teachings of English Grammar and Orthœpy are daily disregarded. We desire not to be hypercritical. We are not so; we only ask for lectures, which will not disgrace us when heard by Allœopathic visitors. We feel this all the more keenly, as his ignorance in this respect is not atoned for by a skill in the "Practice," or a knowledge in the "Principles" of Surgery.

*Seventhly.*—Of all the Faculty, the Professor of Surgery is the only one who has shown any dogmatism. Every chair save his has allowed us to exercise our own reason. *He* has required of us "the very letter of the law," and that only as expounded by Jacob Beakley, M. D.

It is a well-known fact that we as Homœopaths, are taunted with knowing little of Surgery; and in the face of the humiliating truths, we here express regarding the chair of Surgery, we do appeal to the Guardians of our *Alma Mater* that this disgraceful state of things be remedied. Let us, for the sake of Homœopathia, in this the first fortress, from which she did battle with the time-worn systems of Allœopathy, let us, we pray, have such men in the chairs of Surgery and of Practice, as shall do honor to our cause, and enable us to cope more successfully with our enemies.

We are indebted to Professor Semple, for hiding the prosy principles of so precise a science at Chemistry, behind the poetry of its marvellous mutations, and inscrutable mysteries; thus wooing us to seek wisdom.

We are justly proud of Professor Moore, and boldly ask Allœopathia to produce his superior. Well would it be for Homœopathy were all its exponents like him.

We are indebted to Professor Reed, for sounder views of Pathology and Practice, than any we have received from Professor Coxé; and we can ask nothing more from the chair of Physiology than he has given us.

We most seriously espouse Homœopathy as it is taught by Professor Hempel, and we can ask nothing more from the chair of *Materia Medica* than he has given us.

We are sorry to present this, but love for our cause and the best interests of our almost solitary *Alma Mater* demand the truth. We offer these facts with regret, untainted by malice, and earnestly ask your consideration.

SAMUEL A. JONES,  
F. HAHNEMANN EHRMANN,  
JACOB REED, JR.

And nine others."

"Non mihi credendum sed veritati,"  
*believe not me but the truth; you have the causa belli, and the consequences; judge for yourselves.*

SAMUEL A. JONES,  
JACOB REED, JR.,  
F. HAHNEMANN EHRMANN.





NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE



NLM 03276157 7

ARMY  
MEDICAL LIBRARY